

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

BRISTOUT BOURGUIGNON :
 :
 v. : PRISONER
 : Case No. 3:05CV245 (SRU) (WIG)
 :
 THERESA C. LANTZ, et al. :

RULING AND ORDER

Plaintiff has filed a motion asking the court to preserve various items of evidence, including state police reports, state court documents, recordings of an incident occurring on November 3, 2004, and other documents relating to that incident.

Because this motion relates to discovery matters, plaintiff must comply with the requirements of Local Rule 37, D. Conn. L. Civ. R. The rule provides in relevant part:

No motion pursuant to Rules 26 through 37, Fed. R. Civ. P., shall be filed unless counsel making the motion has conferred with opposing counsel and discussed the discovery issues between them in detail in a good faith effort to eliminate or reduce the area of controversy, and to arrive at a mutually satisfactory resolution.

The purpose of this rule is to encourage the parties to make a good faith effort to resolve the dispute without the intervention of the court. See Getschmann v. James River Paper Co., Inc., Civil 5:92cv163 (WWE), slip op. at 2 (D. Conn. January 14, 1993) (court should not "become unnecessarily involved in disputes that can and should be resolved by the parties").

Plaintiff does not indicate that he has contacted defendants' counsel to determine whether defendants possess these documents and request that they be preserved. Thus, he has not complied with the requirements of Local Rule 37. Plaintiff's motion [**doc. #20**] is **DENIED** without prejudice as premature.

SO ORDERED this 9th day of March, 2006, at Bridgeport, Connecticut.

/s/ William I. Garfinkel
WILLIAM I. GARFINKEL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE